

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The final Office Action dated March 28, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 1, 6, 15, 16 and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-22 are pending with claims 10-14 being withdrawn from consideration. Applicants kindly acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5, 16, 19 and 21, but elect not to rewrite these claims to independent form at this time to permit the Examiner an opportunity to reconsider the objections and rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth in this Response. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Applicants have amended the claims of the present application. Accordingly, the objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, page 3 of the Office Action states “the specification lacks antecedent basis for “a second region offset and parallel to the gate line”, “having non-contiguous portions at respective ends of the storage electrode”, and “at the second region of the storage electrode exclusive of the first protective layer”. Applicants submit support for the recited subject matter may be found in the originally filed specification, for example, FIG. 8 and page 15, lines 16-21 of the Specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 6 and 15 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended the claims of the application. Accordingly, the objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,926,235, issued to Han et al. (hereafter “Han”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Han fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Han fails to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device “wherein the storage electrode is directly connected to the pixel electrode on an entire surface of the second region of the storage electrode” as recited in independent claim 6 of the present application. Because Han fails to teach this feature of claim 6, claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-9 are not anticipated by Han. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,091,466, issued to Kim et al. (hereafter “Kim ‘466’”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Kim ‘466 fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Kim ‘466 fails to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device “wherein the storage electrode is directed connected to the pixel electrode on an entire surface of the second region of the storage electrode in areas not including the first protective layer” as recited in independent claim 1. Because Kim ‘466 fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 1, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4 and 20 are not anticipated by Kim ‘466.

Applicants further traverse the rejection because Kim ‘466 fails to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device “wherein the storage electrode is directly connected to the pixel electrode on an entire surface of the second region of the storage electrode” as recited in independent claim 6 of the present application. Because Kim ‘466 fails to teach this feature of claim 6, claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-8 are not anticipated by Kim ‘466.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8 and 20 are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 15, 17, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim '466 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,262,784, issued to Kim (hereafter "Kim '784"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Kim '466 nor Kim '784, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Kim '466 and Kim '784 fail to teach a liquid crystal display device "wherein the pixel electrode directly connects to the storage electrode on an entire surface of the second region in areas not including the first protective layer" as recited in independent claim 15.

The Office Action states that "Kim '466 does not explicitly disclose a second substrate with a liquid crystal layer between the first and second substrates." To compensate for this deficient teaching of Kim '466, the Office Action relies upon the teachings of Kim '784. Based upon the teachings of Kim '784, the Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Kim '466 "for the purpose of obtaining a fully functional liquid crystal display device". Applicants respectfully submit that even if Kim '466 were modified by the teachings of Kim '784, as suggested in the Office Action, the resulting device would fail to have each and every structural feature recited in the claims of the present application. Specifically, the resulting device would fail to provide "the pixel electrode directly connects to the storage electrode on an entire surface of the second region in areas not including the first protective layer" as recited in independent claim 15 of the present application.

Because Kim '466 and Kim '784 fail to teach all the combined features recited in independent claim 15, claim 15 and its dependent claims 17, 18 and 22 are allowable over any combination of Kim '466 and Kim '784. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15, 17, 18 and 22 are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the

Application No.: 10/026,961
Amendment dated July 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated March 28, 2005

Docket No.: 8733.524.00-US

outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie Hayes
Valerie Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant